

MEDICAL DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION

PART I: GENERAL INFORMATION

Type of Requestor: (x) HCP () IE () IC	Response Timely Filed? (x) Yes () No
Requestor's Name and Address. Vista Medical Center Hospital 4301 Vista Rd. Pasadena, TX 77504	MDR Tracking No.: M4-04-5352-01
	TWCC No.:
	Injured Employee's Name:
Respondent's Name and Address TPCIGA for Petrosurance Casual /Rep Box #: 50 Stone Loughlin & Swanson, LLP P.O. Box 30111 Austin, TX 78755	Date of Injury:
	Employer's Name: Highlands Manufacturing
	Insurance Carrier's No.: 9623287

PART II: SUMMARY OF DISPUTE AND FINDINGS

Dates of Service		CPT Code(s) or Description	Amount in Dispute	Amount Due
From	To			
2-13-03	2-20-03	Inpatient Hospitalization	\$23,207.80	\$00.00

PART III: REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY

Position summary was not submitted. However, the Respondent's rationale on the Table of Disputed Services states, "F – Payment not in accordance with Acute In-Patient Stop Loss Per Fee Guideline. M-Code used incorrectly to designate Acute In-Patient Stop Loss per Fee Guideline..."

PART IV: RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY

Position summary of March 1, 2004 states, "... This patient was admitted... for an inpatient pain management stay. Vista has charged a total of \$58,750.14 for all services provided and was reimbursed at the rate of \$20, 854.81..."

PART V: MEDICAL DISPUTE RESOLUTION REVIEW SUMMARY, METHODOLOGY, AND/OR EXPLANATION

This dispute relates to inpatient services provided in hospital setting with reimbursement subject to the provisions of Rule 134.401 (Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guideline). The hospital has requested reimbursement according to the stop-loss method contained in that rule. Rule 134.401(c)(6) establishes that the stop-loss method is to be used for "unusually costly services." The explanation that follows this paragraph indicates that in order to determine if "unusually costly services" were provided, the admission must not only exceed \$40,000 in total audited charges, but also involve "unusually extensive services."

After reviewing the documentation provided by both parties, it does **not** appear that this particular admission involved "unusually extensive services." The UB-92 list the "Prin. Diag. 724.4"; Thoracic or lumbosacral neuritis or radiculitis, unspecified and the "Prin. Procedure 88.90: diagnostic imaging, not elsewhere classified. The operative report of February 14, 2003 identified the procedure as "Injection of contrast material through the injection port of the intrathecal morphine pump to verify catheter patency and catheter level...". Accordingly, the stop-loss method does not apply and the reimbursement is to be based on the per diem plus carve-out methodology described in the same rule.

The total length of stay for this admission was 7 days (consisting of 7 days for surgical). Accordingly, the standard per diem amount due for this admission is equal to \$7,826.00 (7 times \$1,118). The Respondent reimbursed a total of \$20,854.81 (\$3,246.81 for Rev. Code 120, Semi-Private). In addition, the hospital is entitled to additional reimbursement for (implantables/MRIs/CAT Scans/pharmaceuticals) as follows: The requestor did not submit implant invoices; therefore, MDR cannot determine the cost plus 10%.

Considering the reimbursement amount calculated in accordance with the provisions of rule 134.401(c) compared with the amount previously paid by the insurance carrier, we find that no additional reimbursement is due for these services.

PART VI: COMMISSION DECISION

Based upon the review of the disputed healthcare services, the Medical Review Division has determined that the requestor is **not** entitled to additional reimbursement.

Findings and Decision By:

Roy Lewis

6-20-05

Authorized Signature

Typed Name

Date of Order

PART VII: YOUR RIGHT TO REQUEST A HEARING

Either party to this medical dispute may disagree with all or part of the Decision and has a right to request a hearing. A request for a hearing must be in writing and it must be received by the TWCC Chief Clerk of Proceedings/Appeals Clerk within 20 (twenty) days of your receipt of this decision (28 Texas Administrative Code § 148.3). This Decision was mailed to the health care provider and placed in the Austin Representatives box on _____. This Decision is deemed received by you five days after it was mailed and the first working day after the date the Decision was placed in the Austin Representative's box (28 Texas Administrative Code § 102.5(d)). A request for a hearing should be sent to: Chief Clerk of Proceedings/Appeals Clerk, P.O.

Box 17787, Austin, Texas, 78744 or faxed to (512) 804-4011. A copy of this Decision should be attached to the request.

The party appealing the Division's Decision shall deliver a copy of their written request for a hearing to the opposing party involved in the dispute.

Si prefiere hablar con una persona en español acerca de ésta correspondencia, favor de llamar a 512-804-4812.

PART VIII: INSURANCE CARRIER DELIVERY CERTIFICATION

I hereby verify that I received a copy of this Decision and Order in the Austin Representative's box.

Signature of Insurance Carrier: _____ Date: _____